1: Honigmann E-5 (1943-1945) 1949 ND12 Nahane ND12

Although the number of exceptions seems to be increasing, the recognized form of residence in all but secondary marriages is matrilocal.[1] Secondary marriages, where the man is already established on his own trap line, follow independent or patrilocal residence. One of the primary factors that seems to be undermining the custom of matrilocal residence is the inheritance of trap lines. In one instance this economic factor led a man to insist on both matrilocal residence for his daughter and patrilocal residence for his son. River Joe first expressed resentment when his daughter married outside of the Kaska area and took up residence in her husband's community several hundred miles away. "Where he get girl, stay there," Joe stated and pointed out that his daughter had access to a good trap line which could adequately support the couple. A few months later his son, Ted, became interested in a part Tahltan girl from the upper Dease River. Now the father affirmed that when his son married, he should remain on the family trap line. Where a young unmarried man holds ownership in a productive family trap line, or where he is anxious to acquire his own (as was Louis Maza), matrilocal residence is temporary, merely fulfilling the conditions of bride service and lasting only a year or two. When an Indian girl marries a white man independent residence is always followed.

Interesting information was obtained regarding a man's adjustment to the country in which he must operate after marriage. "First time pretty hard for me," Hans Donnelly reported. "I don't want to hunt nothing. I don't want to get lost. Now all right." From this instance it would appear that a man can learn the terrain and routes of a new area in about two years. There is no evidence that matrilocal residence poses any difficult problems of social adjustment for the man. He assumes the authority in his own family, lives in his own dwelling and, except for offering meat and other assistance to his father-in-law, pursues his own economic interests.

Adoption of young children is often practiced to increase the size of the nuclear family. The principal motives are the desire to insure future economic assistance and to provide care and subsistence for an orphan or half orphan whose surviving parent cannot effectively do so. While there are no fixed rules defining adoption, in general the relationship is assumed to be permanent and any measures taken by a surviving parent to abrogate it are regarded with resentment. Nevertheless adoption is often temporary and children often reclaimed by parents or by parents' siblings. Adopted children ideally achieve the status of true children. Manifestly, however, they may be overworked and sometimes are even more deprived of emotional satisfaction than true children. There is reluctance to adopt children who, it is feared, are not normal or healthy.

The private life of the Kaska family is not easy to observe. This is due to the social isolation maintained by the family, as well as to the slight interaction that is manifested publicly between spouses. While several newly married couples revealed signs of close emotional attachment, it is not usual for older ones to demonstrate any considerable amount of affection except possibly when intoxicated. Terms of endearment also seem to be lacking in the conversation of husband and wife, although a number of men (especially when drunk) were observed to address their wives as "mama." The general pattern of relations between marriage

[1] Generalizations based primarily on Upper Liard River data.

1: Honigmann E-5 (1943-1945) 1949 ND12 Nahane ND12

586 Adele to Simpson Lake and would probably try to persuade the girl's father to recognize Adele's new relationship. Shortly after this Nitla left Old Man's place to go to Lower Post.

From this point on it was no longer possible to remain clearly in touch with events as they transpired. Apparently Nitla returned to his father's place and found that, as a result of a series of bitter quarrels, Adele and John had become estranged. In mid-December John reported to the ethnographer that Nitla and Adele were living together on Nitla's father's trap line.

The case is admittedly open to several interpretations but it may serve as an illustration of the interrelated attitudes underlying divorce and of the rationalizations adopted by each member of a triangle to defend himself in the face of public opinion. It is interesting that, despite adverse sentiment, Adele and John were not avoided by other young couples (including John's former wife), but that John and Adele were often reluctant to show themselves in public. Nitla, who felt he had right on his side, found no social pressures he could employ to reestablish his control over either his wife or child. Eventually he was forced to withdraw. In one of his last interviews at Old Man's place he gave some indication of the strength of his emotional reactions. "Can't sit down one place," he said. "Too much worry. Can't stay here. Good-bye—sometime get meat." Asked what he worried about, Nitla replied: "I worry. Your missus stay alone for other man, you can't feel good. I go down Lower Post. He keep my girl too. He say he never keep your girl. He just fool for me . . . Crazy man! No good for woman. That first girl he can't keep it. He get it again. He lick him too. . . . Sometime too much think about it. I don't want to stay here. Too much think about it. . . . Well, he hurting my heart now. I can't let him go my kids. No matter how many mile I go, I can't forget my kids. My kids he hold your mother for me now."

587 While widows are noticeably slow in seeking a new spouse, both divorced and widowed men are quick to seek remarriage. Generally such secondary marriages are more easily accomplished by widowers than by divorcees, since the reputation of the latter is seldom calculated to inspire a woman's confidence. Often a young man who has lost his wife through death will ask her parents for one of her sisters; such a request is readily granted and this may be regarded as a preferred form of secondary marriage. Older men who have been widowed tend to marry widows. Bride service does not occur with a remarriage if the husband already possesses his own trap line and independent residence. Such a man will, however, generally stand ready to assist his father-in-law in any major piece of construction.

843 *Pregnancy.* Like childbirth, pregnancy is not marked by excessive concern or anxiety either in the case of the mother or other people immediately concerned with the process. In the early period of pregnancy the woman exhibits little concern with her own health or with the safety of the fetus. Pregnant girls were observed bicycling and wrestling into the fifth and sixth months. Housework duties and even traveling are continued until the [845] time of parturition. Sometimes this lack of concern results in accidents. Thus John Kazaa's first wife, who was almost ready to deliver, died in a sleigh upset that promoted miscarriage. Commenting on this lack of precaution, Old Man said: "They're not smart. She don't know what's wrong. . . . That's why she die." In the later period of pregnancy a woman is sometimes shy and retires from public appearances. At no time is a woman's pregnancy discussed or commented upon, the process being politely ignored.

59 generally they lived with the bridegroom's people and only visited the friends of the bride.

Whether the husband stayed chiefly with his wife's people or his own did not matter, for during his [431] life time he was under obligation to give presents of food or other things to his wife's parents from time to time, and this was always expected of him. The wife was considered the property of her husband and his people, but this did not mean that others of his male relatives or phratry had any rights of intercourse with her, at least during her husband's life-time. Their [611] children, if they had any, belonged by right to the wife's people, being by descent members of their mother's phratry.

768 In case of death of their father or mother the children, if young, were taken in charge by their mo- [687] ther's people. It seems this was more particularly the case if the mother died and the father did not marry his 582 deceased wife's sister. Marriages between members of different clans and bands were encouraged because of the advantage of thus securing the right of hunting in different grounds.

Early marriages were believed in and most girls were married soon after they had finished their training at puberty. It is stated there were even some cases where girls were married before they were mature or had become pubescent.

ceremonial way, even if he was very much older than she was. Ahlali or people who were of high rank through wealth always aimed to have their children marry among their own class. Sometimes lads or girls of this class followed their hearts and against their class interests married persons who were poor and of low rank. This, however, was exceptional, as it was not easy to go against the wishes of their parents and relatives, and, so it were, lose their caste. This is now almost all broken down as people are about equal to each other nowadays in wealth and the old aristocracy of wealth exists no longer. If a husband habitually ill-treated his wife her father could take her back by paying him for his loss. This was about equal to or a little over the value of the marriage presents received for his daughter and the gifts the husband after marriage had given to him.

Polygamy was practised, but very few man had more than one wife. A few had two. This practice had now died out. No woman had more than one husband.

If a man's wife died her unmarried sister was supposed to become his next wife. If for some reason he did not marry, his children if young were taken by his deceased wife's relatives to be reared by them.

As a nephew succeeded his uncle and inherited his property he also was expected to marry or at least support his uncle's widow.

000 support his uncle's widow.

587 428 606 If a man's uncle had a young wife but he himself was old and had become too poor to support his wife properly, he might say to his nephew, "Henceforth you will look after and support my wife. She will be the same as your wife". The nephew then supported his uncle's wife and after her husband's death she became his wife in reality even although he had a wife already. Etiquette or custom required that a man and his mother-in-law should not speak to each other. The mother-in-law avoided her son-in-law as much as possible. She did not speak to him directly not even meet him if she could help it. If she met him on a trail, she turned her back so as not to see him until he passed. It is said the speaking to each other of mothers-in-law and sons-in-law was also tabooed among the Tlingit.

584 777 The following were beliefs regarding marriage and procreation:

1. It was believed marrying generally changed a person's luck. A man who was unlucky or a poor hunter often became lucky or a good hunter after marriage. Also the reverse was sometimes the case. The change after marriage was due to the man's wife. A man might get a lucky woman or an unlucky one for his wife and this effected the man's luck for good or evil. Some men were not influenced this way after marriage.

6: Honigmann E-5 (1943-1945)1954 ND12 Nahane ND12
Upper Liard

respect to beaver is partly explicable in terms of the animal's habit of remaining and reproducing within a relatively circumscribed district unless population pressure forces migration of the excess stock. Thus in most years Indians could depend upon being able to find food wherever beaver lodges were known to exist.

Of movable goods a man owned the bark and wood dishes, as well as the eating utensils which he made for his family, his own tools, caches (but not the food upon them), personal clothing, canoe, weapons, toboggan, personal snowshoes, and masks. A woman owned the bark- and spruce-root vessels that she manufactured, personal tools, the dwelling, food, prepared skins, personal clothing, all lines except those which she had given to her husband, and paints. Meat on a cache or freshly killed game cannot be considered the exclusive property of either the hunter or his family because the community felt and exercised a claim on such food. Failure to meet this expectation in the case of large game animals aroused resentment. In a sense children owned their toys as well as personal clothing and snowshoes. The mother controlled a child's possessions but they could not be disposed of outside the family, even by lending without the child's permission. By virtue of the control which parents claimed over a young person's nominal possessions they were able to use the latter freely. Although death might be followed by the destruction of some goods belonging to the deceased the custom did not have as its purpose transmission of wealth to the ghost. In the absence of grave goods people did not conceive of the ghost as owning anything. Even the burial clothes worn by the corpse "belonged to nobody."

Aside from one's name, ownership did not attach toward intangible goods. Nobody exercised individual control over songs or folk tales but it is likely that every man enjoyed some exclusive rights over the magical songs which he had dreamed on the vision quest.

Inheritance norms pertained to names and material goods alone.[58] Following death one half of a man's possessions went to his brother while the children divided the other half. Personal items were destroyed. A son usually acquired the scalps taken in battle. The widow might receive a share of the goods to which her brother-in-law enjoyed paramount rights, but her inclusion in inheritance does not appear to have been rigorously enforced. A man could marry his widowed sister-in-law or else could dispose of her to another husband but it is probably incorrect to list this pattern in a discussion of chattels. A woman's wealth fell to the widower, who customarily gave all or most of it to his brother's wife. The knife employed to sever the umbilical cord became the property of a woman's daughter.

---

a lot of trouble between different tribes is started, also amongst the tribe itself." (Field, *Unpublished manuscript* [1913], 9.) Among the Tsetsaut (Beaver Indians of Port Liard, perhaps the same group to which McLean refers), "when an Indian discovers one or more beaver lodges, if not already appropriated, he immediately puts his mark upon them, and no one dares to intrude upon his property without his permission, although I know of no punishment inflicted upon the guilty party unless it be the infamy attached to the action, which is considered as very mean and heinous." Keith, *Letters to Mr. Roderic McKenzie* (1890), 69.

[58] For the inheritance of names see below, p. 161.

6: Honigmann E-5 (1943-1945)1954 ND12 Nahane ND12
Upper Liard
Dease River

543 539 was gone. The children too had been killed. Her husband was gone. The older brother said, "Don't think anything about it till we see our brother-in-law and see how he treats us."

The widower found a beaver den and set a net. He got two beaver. From one he removed the fat and he ate the other. Then his brothers-in-law came along. The husband began to weep. He asked them, "Have you seen what I have done?" He added, "You can kill me if you want to." The older brother said, "I'll do nothing till you eat." The husband picked up a piece of fat and cooked it while holding it in his hand. This gesture demonstrated his courage. He knew he was in danger of being killed but was warding off danger with a show of fearlessness and resistance to pain. He offered some meat to the brothers. When they had eaten the older said, "I'll let you go because your hand is half-cooked now. I'm not going to bother you. I still have a younger sister at home."

593 171 Two observations may be offered concerning this anecdote, first, the responsibility assumed by a brother for his sister's moral conduct in relation to her husband stands out. Second, the use of deliberately induced pain to demonstrate courage should be noted. Both of these patterns are strongly and formally developed in the Plains Culture Area. Not only is the husband in the tale forgiven for killing the stingy woman but he is promised one of her sisters as a new wife.

586 [254] Divorce aroused neither sharp criticism or shame, although the deserted spouse might display more or less resentment. Sometimes a man used sorcery to kill the woman who had quit him or to cause her children by the subsequent husband to die. Reasons for divorce included the desire of one marriage partner for another man or woman (perhaps a man who could provide a richer living than the current husband), cruelty, and adultery. Women did not always permanently quit husbands who treated them badly. Sometimes a wife merely ran off to spend a night in the bush. In case of divorce older children remained with the husband while infants went with the mother. When he became grown-up, a son might return to his father. Both patterns suggest the recency and superficial imposition of matrilineal descent in the culture.

587 Economic benefits accrued to a widow and her children under the levirate. However, unless the real or classificatory brother were single or the husband of the widow's sister he could not live intimately with the woman but merely supported her and her children in his camp.[8] Under such circumstances a widow would remarry following a two year period of mourning and upon receiving the consent of her brother-in-law. To choose a new husband closely following a man's death, aroused the jealousy of the deceased husband's ghost. As already noted, when a wife died her father frequently invited the bereaved husband to choose a sister-in-law as his spouse and might even insist that the latter be taken.[9]

582 583 *Dease River Kaska.* Boys married when they could provide sufficient meat and skins for a family, a girl when she was capable of performing household duties and understood the responsibilities of married life, particularly its ideal of faithfulness. Incest rules extended to include one's moiety. Each sex normally secured the parents' consent

[8] Here lies a powerful incentive for two brothers to marry a pair of sisters. Such a marriage readily accommodates the levirate. It would be desirable to know if there is a significant correlation between these two traits when a large series of cultures are compared.

[9] Levirate and sororate have both been reported for the Tlingit. Among these coastal people a nephew sometimes inherited the widow or the niece of a deceased woman might marry the widower. Jones, *Study of the Tlingits of Alaska* (1914), 138.

6: Honigmann E-5 (1943-1945)1954 ND12 Nahane ND12
Dease River
Tsetona
Upper Liard

to a proposed match. Where such permission was withheld, elopement might follow. The eloping couple then lived alone or, more often, joined another camp. Sometimes angry parents pursued the young people and beat the youth if they caught him. In the normal course of events a young man undertook bride service for a year in the home of his father-in-law. During this period he contrived to have secret sexual relations with his intended spouse. A wealthy father-in-law terminated bride service with a feast, after which the couple were regarded as man and wife. Occasionally fathers arranged engagements between children. Contracted without gift exchange, these agreements were not absolutely binding on the young people and could be abrogated for sufficient cause. Only single men utilized the war party to secure a wife. Residence after marriage was matrilocal.

Sororal polygyny remained limited to wealthy men. Never did a man live with more than two women, plural wives "always got along with each other." The idea of an unrelated woman as co-wife was strongly resented and the presence of such a woman in camp would provoke endless quarreling.[89] Fraternal polyandry existed and is illustrated in a tale reported by Teit, titled "The Deceitful Wife."[90] A woman, married to two brothers, happened to be raped by a war party that prepared to attack her people. The ordeal weakened the woman but the enemy offered her ptarmigan. In return she promised to conceal what had happened. The mother-in-law, however, became suspicious and spoke to her sons. As a result the two husbands sensed danger and proposed to the wife that they all three enjoy a last good meal together. They thereupon killed the woman and fled. An upper Liard River informant reported knowledge of a Dease River Indian who had shared his wife with nine brothers. The ten men alternated in cohabiting with the woman and no trouble ever occurred between them. However, the brothers became extremely jealous when they saw a stranger talk to their wife and reported the incident to the senior husband who warned off the intruder.

Divorce sometimes followed adultery and occasionally a man quit a barren wife. Upon her husband's death a widow became the responsibility of her brother-in-law.

Tsetona. People favored marriage between cross cousins. "Its good for them," the informant explained. The levirate and sororate both obtained.

OLD AGE AND DEATH

Upper Liard Kaska. Many Indians did not live to see old age. Others found their declining years filled with waning prestige and dissatisfaction. With menopause cul-

[89] Allard says: "Polygamy existed among them when they were all pagans. One man would take as many wives as conditions would allow. For instance, if he were a good hunter he would take more than one wife. When I visited the Kaska for the first time in 1925, I found no polygamy among them ... they had never seen a Catholic priest in their country, but being in their native state more moral than the other races of Indians, the influence of their brethern, the Si kan ai, led them easily to abandon polygamy." (Allard, *Notes on the Kaska and Upper Liard Indians* [1928], 25.) We feel incined to ascribe the loss of polygyny much more to the influence of the white men who invaded the Dease River valley after 1872. Cf. Honigmann, *Culture and Ethos of Kaska Society* (1949), 44–45.

[90] Teit, *Kaska Tales* (1917), 461–462.